

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

CENTRAL COAST AREA OFFICE

735 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300

SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903

427-4863

HEARING IMPAIRED: (415) 904-5200

Th9a



November 3, 1997

TO: COMMISSIONERS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

FROM: TAMI GROVE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR
CHARLES LESTER, DISTRICT MANAGER
JOY CHASE, STAFF ANALYST

SUBJECT: CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE MAJOR AMENDMENT #1-97 TO THE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM LAND USE PLAN for public hearing and Commission action at its meeting of December 9-12, 1997 Marin County Board of Supervisors Chambers, Administrative Bldg., Rm 322, Marin County Civic Center, San Rafael, CA 949030

SYNOPSIS

The City of Pacific Grove is requesting that its Land Use Plan be amended to incorporate the Coastal Parks Plan. The City has organized and submitted the amendment request in accordance with the standards for amendments to certified LCP's (Coastal Act Section 30514, California Code of Regulations 13551 through 13553). The City Council held noticed public hearings and approved the document on March 5, 1997. In addition noticed public hearings at the Planning Commission level were held. This amendment request was filed on May 20, 1997 pursuant to Section 30510(b) of the Coastal Act and Sections 13553 of the California Code of Regulations.

The amendment was scheduled for a July 1997 hearing but was postponed to allow discussion between the Commission staff, the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District and the City of Pacific Grove regarding classification and future design of a segment of the regional bikeway as a Class III bikeway (shares road with vehicles). The Park District strongly recommends a minimum Class II bikeway (striped lanes adjacent to vehicle lanes). On August 13, 1997 the Commission approved a request by the City to extend the 90 day time limit.

The City, the Park District and Commission staff met in August to tour Ocean View Boulevard and discuss the issue of the City's proposed bikeway designation. No consensus was reached. The City of Pacific Groves maintains that they have carefully studied the issue of bikeway classification and after full public participation concluded that a Class III bikeway is the only option. The City has not agreed to modifications to the Coastal Parks Plan.

At the request of the City Amendment #1-97 has been scheduled for the December hearing in Northern California to facilitate public participation.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED MAJOR AMENDMENTS AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

The focus of the proposed Coastal Parks Plan is public access and recreation and the resource elements that affect its quality. With limited exceptions Pacific Grove's oceanfront lands are already in public ownership. Land Use Plan policy 5.4.3 provides for the development of a Coastal Parks Plan for the coastal parklands which improves accessways, signing, prevents

overuse and provides standards for management of access. The goals of the certified Land Use Plan for the Coastal Parks Plan are fully consistent with the Access and Recreation Policies of the Coastal Act discussed above. Chapter 3 through 7 of the Coastal Parks Plan comprise the main body of the plan, each chapter providing first a concept and then the guidelines for future improvements. Chapters 3 through 7 address trails, bikeways, parking and circulation; coastal resources; and visual quality and appearance. Chapter 8 establishes an access guide; and Chapter 9 provides for a seawall program.

The Amendments were designated by Commission staff as **Amendment 1**, Chapter 3, Trails; **Amendment 2**, Chapter 4, Bikeways; **Amendment 3**, Chapter 5, Parking and Circulation; **Amendment 4**, Chapter 8, Access Guide; **Amendment 5**, Chapter 6, Coastal Resources; **Amendment 6**, Chapter 7 Visual Resources; and **Amendment 7**, Chapter 9, Seawall Program.

(1) To provide for Commission oversight of preferential parking programs which can displace public parking, staff has recommended a modification to Amendment 3, Guideline 12 of Chapter 5, Parking and Circulation, to require Commission review of parking reorganizations and exclusionary parking programs. See Modification 1. As modified, to protect existing access, Chapter 5, Parking and Circulation is consistent with the Coastal Act and the certified LUP.

(2) In Amendment 2, Chapter 4, Bikeways, the City proposes to designate the bikeway along Ocean View Boulevard from 17th Street at Lovers Point to its intersection with Asilomar Avenue as a Class III Bikeway. A Class III Bikeway indicates that the bicycles share the road with vehicles. This proposed Class III section would connect the Class I Monterey Bay Coastal Trail and the Class II Ocean View Boulevard Bikeway. The bikeway is a segment of the regional Monterey Bay Coastal Trail. The MPRPD strongly recommends that the minimal bikeway designation on the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail be Class II. A Class II bikeway provides a separate, striped bike lane adjacent to each vehicle lane. Staff agrees with the Park District and recommends Guideline 2 and 3 of Chapter 4, Bikeways, be modified to provide that a Class III bikeway is an interim measure and that Guideline 4 be modified to require that a Class I or Class II bikeway be established between the end of the existing Monterey Bay Coastal Trail class I bikeway at 17th Street along Ocean View Boulevard to Asilomar Avenue. See Modifications 2 and 3. As modified, Chapter 4, considers access in its regional context and provides for greater safety and continuity for bicyclists consistent with Coastal Act Access policies.

(3) For Amendment 4, Chapter 8, Access Guide, to provide for consistency with proposed Modifications 2 and 3, Commission staff has recommended modifications to Chapter 8, Access Guide, Map 4 Esplanade/Otter Point, Recommended Actions, Bikeways (p. 66) and Map 5, Lovers Point, Recommended Actions, Bikeways (p. 70) to add an Action to require that a Class I or Class II bikeway shall be established between the end of the existing Monterey Bay Coastal Trail Class I bikeway at 17th Street to Asilomar Avenue on Ocean View Boulevard. See Modification 4.

In all other respects the Coastal Parks Plan expands on and is consistent with the Land Use Plan policies and the Coastal Act.

The Staff recommends approval of LUP amendment #1-97, amendments 1, 5-7, as submitted and approval as modified for amendments 2, 3, and 4..

Exhibit A, City Resolution No. 7-013, Resolution of Submittal

Exhibit B, City Letter Requesting processing as Land Use Plan amendment.

Exhibit C, Letter Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District, July 8, 1997.

Enclosure, Pacific Grove Coastal Parks Plan, An Element of the Pacific Grove Local Coastal Program, March 1997

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

Staff recommends adoption of the following resolution:

I. APPROVAL OF LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT 1-97, AMENDMENTS #1 AND 5 through 7 AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION I

I move that the Commission certify Major Amendment 1-97, Amendments 1 and 5 through 7 to the City of Pacific Grove Land Use Plan as submitted.

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. An affirmative vote by a majority of the appointed Commissioners is needed to pass the motion.

RESOLUTION I

The Commission hereby certifies amendments 1 and 5 through 7 of Major Amendment #1-97 to the Land Use Plan of the City of Pacific Grove as submitted for the specific reasons discussed in the recommended findings on the grounds that, as submitted, the amendment and the LUP as thereby amended meet the requirements of the Coastal Act. The amendment is consistent with applicable decisions of the Commission that guide local government actions pursuant to Section 30625(c) and approval will not have significant adverse environmental effects for which feasible mitigation measures have not been employed consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act.

II. DENIAL OF LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT 1-97, AMENDMENTS 2, 3, AND 4 AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION II

I move that the Commission certify Major Amendment 1-97, Land Use Plan Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to the City of Pacific Grove Land use Plan as submitted.

Staff recommends a **NO** vote. An affirmative vote by a majority of the appointed Commissioners is needed to pass the motion.

RESOLUTION II:

The Commission hereby rejects amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Land Use Plan Amendment #1-97 of the City of Pacific Grove Local Coastal Program for the specific reasons discussed in the following findings on the grounds that it does not meet the requirements of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. There are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse environmental effects which the approval of this amendment would have on the environment.

III. APPROVAL OF LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT 1-97, AMENDMENTS 2, 3, AND 4 IF MODIFIED AS SUGGESTED.

MOTION III

I move that the Commission certify Major Amendment 1-97, Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to the City of Pacific Grove Land use Plan if it is modified as suggested.

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. An affirmative vote by a majority of the appointed Commissioners is needed to pass the motion.

RESOLUTION III

The Commission hereby certifies Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Land Use Plan amendment #1-97 of the City of Pacific Grove Local Coastal Program according to Modification 1 for the specific reasons discussed in the following findings on the grounds that, as modified, these amendments and the LUP as thereby amended meets the requirements of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. These amendments, as modified, are consistent with applicable decisions of the Commission that guide local government actions pursuant to Section 30625(c) and approval will not have significant environmental effects for which feasible mitigation measures have not been employed consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act.

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS

Key: additions are underlined.

AMENDMENT 3

MODIFICATION 1. Amendment 3, a Guideline 12 shall be added to Chapter 5, Parking and Circulation as follows:

12. Prior to certification of the Local Coastal Program, Traffic Commission recommendations for the reorganization of existing parking areas as authorized by the City Council and any exclusionary parking programs shall be submitted to the Coastal

Commission for coastal permit review. Following certification of the Local Coastal Program, any exclusionary parking programs shall require a Local Coastal Program Amendment.

AMENDMENT 2

MODIFICATION 2. Amendment 2, Guideline 2 and 3 of Chapter 4, Bikeways, shall be modified as follows:

2. As an interim measure designate 17th Street, between the terminus of the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail on the south and Ocean View Boulevard on the north, as a Class III Bikeway and retain parking on both sides of the street.
3. As an interim measure due to the existing narrow street width, the proximity of residences, and the intensity of varied recreational uses (including walking, cycling, diving, and other coastal recreational uses), designate Ocean View Boulevard from 17th Street at Lovers Point to its intersection with Asilomar Avenue as a Class III Bikeway.

MODIFICATION 3: Amendment 2, replace Guideline 4 of Chapter 4, Bikeways, as follows and renumber existing Guideline 4 as Guideline 5.

4. Establish a Class I or Class II bikeway between the end of the existing Monterey Bay Coastal Trail Class I Bikeway at 17th Street to Asilomar Avenue. The bikeway shall, to the extent feasible, use existing paved surfaces of Ocean View Boulevard. This alignment may require conversion of the street to one-way traffic and/or reduction of street parking along the seaward side of the the boulevard. Such Class I or Class II bikeway shall be established as soon as feasible; and, if not previously undertaken, should be incorporated in any major development project(s) in this oceanfront corridor (such as rebuilding of Ocean View Boulevard or replacement of the regional sanitary sewer line).

AMENDMENT 4

MODIFICATION 4. Amendment 4, to provide for internal consistency Chapter 8, Access Guide, Map 4 Esplanade/Otter Point, Recommended Actions, Bikeways (p. 66) and Map 5, Lovers Point, Recommended Actions, Bikeways (p. 70) should be modified to add an Action to require that a Class I or Class II bikeway shall be established between the end of the existing Monterey Bay Coastal Trail class I bikeway at 17th Street to Asilomar Avenue on Ocean View Boulevard.

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS

1. Background

Area Description and Location: The City of Pacific Grove was incorporated in 1889 and has a 1990 census population of 16,117. It is located 120 miles south of San Francisco. Pacific Grove encompasses almost three square miles of land that wraps around Point Pinos, the southernmost point

of Monterey Bay and lies between the City of Monterey upcoast and Pebble Beach in Monterey County to the South. The proposed Coastal Parks Plan planning area encompasses approximately 248 acres of public lands in the Pacific Grove coastal zone including Point Pinos Lighthouse Reservation and the municipal golf course; the Asilomar State Beach and Conference Grounds; the Southern Pacific right-of-way; and all the city lands seaward of Oceanview Boulevard and Sunset Drive and the public roads paralleling the sea. These are largely undeveloped lands designated Open Space/Recreational or Open Space/Institutional in the City's certified Land Use Plan.

Procedural Background: The Pacific Grove Land Use Plan was certified by the Commission on December 15, 1988. The Land Use Plan contains four major sections: Resource Management, Land Use and Development, Public Facilities, and Public Shoreline Access.

Chapter 2, Resource Management, of the Land Use Plan, General Policy 2.3.4, policy 3, states:

As funding is available the City will develop a Coastal Parks Plan for the management and restoration of the Pacific Grove coastal parklands, including the Lighthouse Reservation. The purpose of the Plan, in part, is to:

- a) Rehabilitate areas damaged by pedestrian/auto/ground squirrel overuse;
- b) Revegetate with native bluff and dune plants where feasible;
- c) Protect habitats of rare and endangered species;
- d) Provide defined pathways or boardwalks, where desirable, and control unrestricted parking by appropriate barriers or other means; and
- e) Expand existing signs to include interpretive information for visitors.
- f) Implement LCP policies on coastal access, visual resources, and seawall construction.
- g) Preserve any Monarch butterfly overwintering sites which may be identified, and enhance vegetation used for nectaring and feeding by the Monarchs.

The Coastal Parks Plan (Parks Plan) historically was considered to be part of the Local Coastal Program Implementation. However, a review by the Commission legal staff and the City of Pacific Grove revealed that in fact the Coastal Parks Plan was a policy document and was more appropriately amended into the Land Use Plan. The Parks Plan has provisions to guide design, management, restoration and enhancement of the coastal parks planning area. The Implementing Ordinances currently being developed by the City will provide the detailed regulations to effectively implement the policies found in the certified Land Use Plan as amended to incorporate the Coastal Parks Plan.

The City's public notices identified the Coastal Parks Plan as one component of the Implementation Plan, the other being the forthcoming zoning regulations. Nevertheless, the public notices allowed for full public participation in the process consistent with the Commission's Administrative Regulations. The City's resolution of submittal to the Coastal Commission approves and submits the Parks Plan as a component of the Local Coastal Program. Attached as Exhibit B is a letter from the Pacific Grove Community Development Director asking the Commission to process the submittal as a Land Use Plan amendment.

The standard of review for a Land Use Plan amendment is Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act (California Code of Regulations Section 13528). As an amendment to the Land Use Plan the Coastal Parks Plan must also be consistent with the certified Land Use Plan as well as the Coastal Act.

2. Public Access and Recreation

Section 30001.5(c) of the coastal Act states:

The Legislature further finds and declares that the basic goals of the state for the coastal zone are:...(c) Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners.

Section 30210 of the Coastal Act states:.

In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

Section 30211 of the Act protects the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through use or legislative authorization and Section 30212 provides for new public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast. Section 30212.5 of the Coastal Act provides for the distribution of public facilities, including parking, to mitigate against overcrowding and overuse by the public of any single area.

Section 30213 of the Coastal Act states in part:

Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.

The recreational policies of the Coastal Act Sections 30220 through 30244 give priority to recreational and coastal dependent uses in coastal areas and on oceanfront lands. Section 30223 provides that upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible.

The focus of the proposed Coastal Parks Plan is public access and recreation and the resource elements that affect its quality. With limited exceptions Pacific Grove's oceanfront lands are already in public ownership. The certified Pacific Grove Land Use Plan states that the only beaches lacking public access in the City are those adjacent to Stanford's Hopkins Marine Lab where sensitive resources exist. Land Use Plan policy 5.4.3 provides for the development of a Coastal Parks Plan for the coastal parklands which improves accessways, signing, prevents overuse and provides standards for management of access. The goals of the Land Use Plan for the Coastal Parks Plan are fully consistent with the Access and Recreation Policies of the Coastal Act discussed above.

Chapters 1 and 2 provide an Introduction and a discussion of the Goals and Objectives of the Coastal Parks Plan. Chapter 3 through 7 of the Coastal Parks Plan comprise the main body of the plan, each chapter providing first a concept and then the guidelines for future improvements. Chapters 3 through 7 address trails, bikeways, parking and circulation; coastal resources; and visual quality and appearance.

Chapter 8 establishes an access guide; and Chapter 9 provides for a seawall program.

Amendment 1: Chapter 3, Trails: The Pacific Grove Coastal Parks Plan seeks to establish a continuous, barrier free and safe trail system along the shoreline while protecting significant coastal resources. The Plan has 23 guidelines to improve trail access in general and in specific areas. Guidelines promote improvements to make the trails wheelchair accessible including guidelines on width, slopes and trail materials. The guidelines recommend consolidation of trails and the use of landscaping and other erosion control measures to minimize impacts on vegetation and improve habitat and the visual context. They also provide for construction of trail sections to join discontinuous segments of the trail. The Southern Pacific right-of-way is proposed for acquisition as a recreational trail/open space corridor. The Plan also requires retention of existing public restrooms, identifies a specific additional site, and recommends consideration of additional sites.

Figure 3, Trails, of the enclosed Coastal Parks Plan visually describes the existing and proposed trail system.

Chapter 3, Trails, of the Coastal Parks Plan maintains existing access and provides for improvements which will maximize future public access and is consistent with the Access and Recreation policies of the Coastal Act.

Amendment 2: Chapter 4, Bikeways. Pacific Grove has many miles of bikeways. The Coastal Parks Plan will provide for Phase III of the City's Bikeway Plan which will connect existing Phases I and II to provide a continuous coastal bikeway system through the City and also connect to the Monterey City bikeway and the Del Monte Forest access routes. This bikeway through the City is designated as a segment of the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail.

Phase I is a Class I Bikeway (a trail separate from vehicles) from the Monterey Bay Aquarium to Lover's Point; Phase II is a Class II Bikeway (a separate bike lane adjacent to each vehicle lane) from the City limits at Del Monte Forest along the coastal roads around Lighthouse Reservation. In Phase III the City proposes to connect the two existing bikeway segments with a Class III bikeway along Ocean View Boulevard between 17th Street at Lovers Point to its intersection with Asilomar Boulevard.

A Class III Bikeway is established by signing the road to indicate that the vehicular lanes are shared with bicyclists. Bicycle use is a secondary use.

The Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District has expressed serious concerns regarding the safety of bicyclists on a Class III bikeway.

Bikeway Classifications and Design Criteria

The Caltrans California Highway Design Manual, July 1993 provides Bikeway Classifications and Design Criteria restated below.

- Class I Bikeways (bike paths) are facilities with exclusive rights of way, with cross flows by motorists minimized.... Class I bikeways [are described] as serving "the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians". However, experience has shown that if significant pedestrian use is anticipated, separate facilities for pedestrians are necessary to minimize conflicts. Class I Bikeways are bike paths entirely separate from roadways. The minimum paved width for a two-way bike path is eight feet with a two foot wide graded area on either side. The minimum paved width for a one-way bike path is five feet.
- Class II Bikeways (bike lanes) for preferential use by bicycles are established within the paved areas of highways. Bikelane stripes are intended to promote an orderly flow of traffic by establishing specific lines of demarcation between areas reserved for bicycles and lanes to be occupied by motor vehicles. Bike lanes shall be one-way facilities. When bike lanes are located between the parking area and the traffic lanes, the bike lane minimum width is five feet. Where parking is prohibited and the bike lane is located contiguous to the curb, the minimum width of the bike lane is four feet.
- Class III bikeways (bike routes) are intended to provide continuity to the bikeway system. Bike routes are established along through routes not served by Class I or II bikeways, or to connect discontinuous segments of bikeway (normally bike lanes). Class III facilities are shared facilities, either with motor vehicles on the street, or with pedestrians on sidewalks, and in either case bicycle usage is secondary. Class III facilities are established by placing Bike Route signs along roadways. Minimum widths for Class III bikeways are not presented.

The Coastal Parks Plan illustrates the three Types of Bikeways in Figure 5, page 30, as they would apply in Pacific Grove.

Coastal Parks Plan Policies at Issue:

The policies of the Coastal Parks Plan at issue are described in Chapter 4 (pages 25-30), Bikeways. Guidelines 2 and 3 state:

2. Designate 17th Street, between the terminus of the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail on the south and Ocean View Boulevard on the north, as a Class III Bikeway and retain parking on both sides of the street.
3. Due to the existing narrow street width, the proximity of residences, and the intensity of varied recreational uses (including walking, cycling, diving, and other coastal recreational uses), designate Ocean View Boulevard from 17th Street at Lovers Point to its intersection with Asilomar Avenue as a Class III Bikeway.

The Assessor's Parcel Maps show that 17th Street between the terminus of the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail and Ocean View Boulevard to the north along Lovers Point is a two-block segment with a 40 foot right-of-way. It has two travel lanes, one in each direction, and parking on both sides of the street. The adjacent Lovers Point Park is a popular headland with a wide grassy area, public restrooms, trails, and a small beach. The Class I Monterey Bay Coastal Trail from the north ends at Lovers Point Park.

Ocean View Boulevard between 17th Street and Asilomar Avenue is approximately one mile in length. The boulevard on the seaside abutts Pacific Grove's shoreline park, a narrow, linear park running the length of Ocean View Boulevard. The park is colorfully landscaped with native and exotic plants and has a narrow dirt or decomposed granite pedestrian path or paths for most of its length. The Ocean View Boulevard right-of-way is shown as 60 feet wide. Traffic travels in both directions and there is parking on both sides of the street. The actual developed road width is typically about 40 feet though there is not a uniform width. It is not clear if the other 20 feet of right-of-way has become a portion of Shoreline Park or, on the inland side of the Boulevard, has been landscaped by the property owners. (The above descriptions of the right-of-ways have not been verified by City staff.)

Monterey Bay Regional Park District Comments of Concern

In a letter to the City of Pacific Grove the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District (MPRPD) described its area and mission as follows,

The Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District is a special district whose boundaries include the City of Pacific Grove. The District represents over 150,000 residents of the greater Monterey Peninsula. The District's mission is to acquire and protect undeveloped open space for public use and habitat protection wherever and whenever possible. To support this mission, the District has been a primary force in the creation of the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail and an outspoken advocate of coastal public access and protection.

In commenting on Chapter 4, Bikeways, of the Coastal Parks Plan, the MPRPD said:

The District is very strong on the minimum designation of the Monterey Bay Coastal trail as a Class II trail. The proposal to designate sections of the trail as Class III is inconsistent with the plan's (and the City's) stated guideline "to achieve a safe and continuous coastal bikeway system..." (page 27). The Plan also states that, "Due to the existing narrow street width... and the intensity of varied recreational uses...[the trail along] Ocean View boulevard from 17th Street at Lovers Point to its intersection with Asilomar Avenue...[is to be designated] as a Class III Bikeway" (page 27). We believe that *because* of the narrowness of the street and the variety of uses that a Class II designation and striping is a necessity for safety. The integrity and safety of this linear accessway should have priority over the convenience of parking cars.

The MPRPD further comments on Map 5, Recommended Actions, Bikeways, (page 70)

Map 5; Recommended Actions, Bikeways: We recommend that the City include a third action item that, "Provide a continuous Class II bikeway along Ocean View Boulevard and 17th Street from the terminal end of the existing Class I trail." We suggest eliminating seaward side parking which will also have the benefit of truly establishing "...continuous unobstructed views along Ocean View..." and optimizing bicycle safety.

And finally, the MPRPD wrote:

The District realizes the tough choice that needs to be made with regard to the on-street seaward parking issue, but is also quite cognizant of the spectacularly unique opportunity the City has to truly protect and enhance its precious coastal viewshed while facilitating non-motorized experiences and vastly improving bicycle safety.

Discussion

Section 30501(b) of the Coastal Act reads states that recommended uses that are of more than local importance should be considered in the preparation of local coastal programs. Such uses may be listed generally or the commission may, from time to time, recommend specific uses for consideration by any local government.

The California Code of Regulations, Section 13513. Uses of More Than Local Importance, states in part:

(a) General categories of uses of more than local importance that shall be considered in preparation of LCPs and LRDPs include but are not limited to: (1) state and federal parks and recreation areas and other recreatoinal facilities of regional or statewide significance...(6) uses of larger-than-local importance, such as coastal agriculture, fisheries, wildlife habitats, or uses that maximize public access to the coast, such as accessways, visitor-serving developments, as generally referenced in the findings, declarations, and policies of the California Coastal Act of 1976.

Section 30001.5(c) of the Coastal Act states that one of the basic goals of the state for the coastal zone is to maximize public access and public recreational opportunities consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. Section 30210 provides in part that maximum access and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs, the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse. Section 30212.5 provides for the distribution of public facilities, including parking, to mitigate against overcrowding and overuse by the public of any single area. Section 30213 protects lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.

There are many facets to public access and recreation. The City's greatest recreational asset is probably its visual setting. It is well known for its beautiful coastline. Ocean View Drive and Sunset Drive do not act as thoroughfares but as a safe and convenient scenic drive. The parallel shoreline park is carpeting with colorful iceplants and other exotic and native plants. Narrow pedestrian trails meander along the coast in an almost continuous path. Automobiles

can be parked on either side of the street for convenient access to the park and rocky coast. Scuba diving is popular in certain areas along the shore. All of these recreational uses are supported by the Coastal Act and can be identified as of regional importance. Managing these recreational uses to protect coastal resources while maximizing physical access and maintaining a quality recreational experience was a primary goal of the Coastal Parks Plan.

Recreationalists of all categories hike and bike the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail in large numbers. The City's Class I Monterey Bay Coastal Trail ends at Lovers Point. The Point is a park with restrooms and benches. Restaurants are immediately adjacent. However, the long term goal of the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District is to provide a trail designed for recreational and commuter use region wide. Under the proposed policies of the Coastal Parks Plan the Class I trail would shift to Class III at Lovers Point and bicycles would intermingle with automobiles. Though Ocean View Boulevard traffic is basically sightseers and slower than thoroughfare traffic, nevertheless only more confident bicyclists are comfortable sharing the road with automobiles. A shared roadway tends to exclude less skilled bicyclists and families with children.

A goal of the Coastal Parks Plan is to "ensure the opportunities for people of all ages, needs and capacities to enjoy safe bicycling." The Plan says Phase III "will establish a continuous coastal bikeway and promote safe bicycle travel for local and regional users along the entire city shoreline". It is questionable whether a Class III bikeway can fulfill this goal.

The Commission staff met with the City of Pacific Grove elected officials, City Manager and planning and public works staff, and with the Director of the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District. The group toured the bikeway alignment and discussed several options to provide a safer continuous regional bike trail.

Options discussed in more or less detail included (1) elimination of parking on the oceanside of Ocean View Boulevard; (2) converting Ocean View Boulevard to one way traffic which would provide for Class II bike lanes on each side of the street or could allow for the landward alignment of the roadbed freeing the ocean side of the right of way to develop a Class I bike path paralleling the existing pedestrian trail; (3) where Ocean View Boulevard is not wide enough to accommodate parking, two-way vehicular traffic and a bike path, establishing a Class I bike path with the landward edge of Shoreline Park and Lovers Point Park (would convert several segments of existing informal pedestrian path to a full-width paved shared use facility; (4) widening Ocean View Boulevard at its narrowest points to provide for Class II bike lanes in addition to 2-way traffic and parking on both sides of street (would involve encroachment into the edge of Shoreline Park.

These alternatives raise several issues. If parking is removed from one side of the street to provide bike lanes, displaced parkers may move into the neighborhoods. The residents are opposed to the increased congestion. If the Shoreline Park trail is widened to include a bike lane, park landscaping could be impacted. Though the Ocean View right-of-way is 60 feet and the developed road area varies but is approximately 40 feet; a large part of the right of way is not being used for bicycle or vehicular access. However, the source of encroachments is not available to Commission staff. If one does not exist, a survey would need to be undertaken to determine the source of the encroachments. If there is residential encroachment, it could be in

the form of landscaping, patios or buildings. Though removal of landscaping, on either side of the right of way may be possible, removal of buildings could not be considered feasible in the foreseeable future.

The potential for one-way traffic, freeing a lane for conversion to bike use, was not considered by the City during the planning process.

The City of Pacific Grove extensively reviewed most of the alternatives during the planning process and did not find them acceptable.

Nevertheless, the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail is of regional significance and can function as both a recreational and a commuter route. The greater the continuity and safety of the route the better it will serve the public. The alternatives available to the City are diverse and allow choices that can minimize impacts to parking and landscaping. Within the broader context the establishment of a successful regional bikeway on balance will more closely achieve the goals of the Coastal Act than preservation of two way traffic or on street parking. The MPRPD has indicated their willingness to assist the City both in planning and in funding to achieve a safe continuous Trail. The Commission staff has also indicated its support to assist the City in solving this issue.

Staff recommends Guideline 2 and 3 of Chapter 4, Bikeways, be modified to provide that a Class III bikeway is an interim measure and that Guideline 4 be modified to require that a Class I or Class II bikeway be established between the end of the existing Monterey Bay Coastal Trail class I bikeway at 17th Street along Ocean View Boulevard to Asilomar Avenue. To the extent feasible existing paved surfaces should be used and the conversion should be completed within one year of certification of a complete Local Coastal Program, or five years from certification of this policy whichever is first. Please see Modifications 2 and 3.

Therefore, as modified Chapter 4, Bikeways, of the Coastal Parks Plan will improve and maximize future public access and is consistent with the Access and Recreation policies of the Coastal Act.

Amendment 3: Chapter 5, Parking and Circulation. The Land Use Plan states that no major road improvements in the coastal zone area are proposed. General Policy 4.2.4.2 of the LUP provides that access shall be enhanced by reducing the impact of the automobile by in part encouraging the use of the bus system and by providing pedestrian/bicycle trails. Specific policy 4.2.5. states that preparation of the Coastal Parks Plan shall include an investigation of means to maximize safety of pedestrians and bicyclists. (Pedestrian and bicycle use is also addressed under Trails and Bikeways.)

The City's principle traffic circulation system within the coastal zone includes Ocean View Boulevard and Sunset Drive as a continuous two lane scenic drive. According to the Parks Plan, the coastal parking and circulation system is not always adequate for the current level of demand and the Plan proposes to optimize parking opportunities by organizing and delineating spaces in some existing parking areas both to manage parking and to enhance safety conditions for vehicles, bicyclist and pedestrians. The City does not propose to increase or expand parking areas because it is considered incompatible with preservation of shoreline

assets. Coastal Parks Plan Circulation Policy 4 recommends limiting the number of parked cars along Sunset Drive and Ocean View Boulevard west of Asilomar Avenue to smaller parking pockets to maximize and enhance coastal views, control public access, and protect habitat.

Coastal Act access policies seek to enhance and maximize access but also recognize that parking areas and other public facilities need to be distributed to mitigate against overuse of any single area (PRC 30213). The City has indicated that the current level of parking is the maximum acceptable consistent with maintaining a quality coastal experience. The Coastal Parks Plan recommends that reorganization of shoreline parking will be undertaken after a Traffic Commission study and recommendation and City Council authorization. An issue of growing concern to the Coastal Commission is the use of exclusionary parking as a management tool, e.g. residential preferential parking programs. Some programs have been found consistent with Coastal Act access policies; others have not. Preferential parking programs are subject to coastal development permit requirements. Though no such program is currently proposed, to ensure that the City and the Commission work closely to solve parking management issues consistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, a policy should be added to the Coastal Parks Plan that clarifies this subject. The policies need to clarify that prior to certification of the Local Coastal Program the Commission has coastal permit review jurisdiction of both the Traffic Commission Study and any exclusionary parking programs that may be proposed, both of which will be important in achieving an appropriate balance. Because each proposed exclusionary parking program raises different and often important access issues, the Commission finds that a blanket acceptance of such programs under the Local Coastal Program is inappropriate and that following certification of the Local Coastal Program, exclusionary parking programs shall require a Local Coastal Program Amendment.

Staff recommends that a Guideline 12 shall be added to Amendment 3, Chapter 5, Parking and Circulation, to provide that prior to certification of the Local Coastal Program Traffic Commission recommendations for the reorganization of existing parking areas as authorized by the City Council and any exclusionary parking programs shall be submitted to the Coastal Commission for coastal permit review. Following certification of the Local Coastal Program, any exclusionary parking programs shall require a Local Coastal Program Amendment.

Please see Modification 1. As modified Amendment 3, Chapter 5, Parking and Circulation, is consistent with the Access Policies of the Coastal Act.

Amendment 4: Chapter 8, Access Guide. The Coastal Parks Plan provides an Access Guide with recommendations to maximize public access to and along the Pacific Grove coast, including trails, bikeways, and parking. The planning area is divided into six areas: Asilomar South, Asilomar North, Point Pinos, Esplanade/Otter Point, Lovers Point and Berkwick Park/Monterey Bay Aquarium. Each planning section describes existing conditions including ownership; land use, trail access, bike access, road access, parking, transit access, existing public safety issues and then recommends actions consistent with the guidelines of the proceeding chapters. Maps and sections are provided for each area.

To provide for internal consistency in the Coastal Parks Plan regarding the requirement for a Class I or Class II bikeway along 17th/Ocean View in proposed Modification 3, of Amendment 3

Bikeways, Chapter 8, Access Guide, Map 4 Esplanade/Otter Point, Recommended Actions, Bikeways (p. 66) and Map 5, Lovers Point, Recommended Actions, Bikeways (p. 70) should be modified to require that a Class I or Class II bikeway shall be established.

3, 4, the Recommended Actions, 5, and 8 promote good management and maintenance and rehabilitation of existing public access opportunities and provisions for additional improvements to public access. As discussed above the concepts and guidelines are consistent with the Coastal Act and are consistent with the certified Land Use Plan.

3. Natural Resources

Amendment 5: Chapter 6, Coastal Resources. Chapter 6 of the Coastal Parks Plan addresses four specific resources: Land Resources, Water and Marine Resources, Scenic Resources, and Archaeologic Resources. The policies of the Parks Plan build on those of the existing Land Use Plan.

Section 30240 of the Coastal Act requires protection of environmentally sensitive areas and limits development to resource dependent uses. In Land Resources, the Plan requires a detailed study by a qualified botanist/biologist prior to any development of any trails or other development and requires boardwalks and fencing as mitigation if needed. The Plan also recommends bluff and dune restoration between Asilomar State Beach and Asilomar Avenue. Other guidelines include removal of exotics and restoration with native species, a formal agreement with State Parks for management of the seaward area of Lighthouse Reservation, protection of Monarch butterfly nectar sources, and a deer management program. These guidelines are consistent with protection of sensitive habitat and Section 30240 of the Coastal Act.

The Marine Environment Article, Sections 30230 through 30233, of the Coastal Act provides for protection, maintenance, and enhancement, where feasible, of marine resources. The biological productivity and quality of coastal waters must be protected to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and diking, filling and dredging is limited to coastal dependent uses such as ports and maintenance dredging.

The Plan's Water and Marine Resources guidelines promote strict enforcement of state and local regulations for the Pacific Grove Marine Gardens and Areas of Special Biological Significance. Visitor management through signing, fencing and educational efforts is promoted. Crespi Pond and Majella Slough, the area's two wetlands, are limited to maintenance dredging and restoration activities to prevent eutrophication and sedimentation. The Coastal Plan identifies the appropriate diver access points where parking and stairways exist. The guideline directions are consistent with the more detailed certified Land Use Plan policies and with the Marine Resource policies of the Coastal Act.

Scenic Resources. The guidelines repeat the Coastal Act policies for protecting visual resources and emphasize the use of local, native and drought tolerant species and avoidance of plants that would block coastal views. See discussion Chapter 7, Visual Quality and Appearance below.

Archaeological Resources: Section 30244 of the Coastal Act provides that where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.

In addition to the policies of the certified LUP the Coastal Parks Plan in its Archaeological Resources guidelines provides for consultation with a qualified archaeologist to review the sites for all proposed improvements in the planning area and to provide adequate mitigation if significant resources are found. This reaffirms the policies of the Land Use Plan and is consistent with the Coastal Act Section 30244.

4. Visual Resources

Amendment 6: Chapter 7, Visual Quality and Appearance. Section 30251 of the Coastal Act states in part:

The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas...

According to the proposed Coastal Parks Plan the concept for the visual quality and appearance of the Pacific Grove shoreline is to preserve and enhance three distinct and identifiable characters along the coast: the urban park, the garden park and the rugged coast. Along Ocean View Boulevard from the City of Monterey to Lovers Point the oceanside is public beach frontage and the inland side is residential and commercial areas. The public lands hold the highly used Monterey Bay Coastal Trail and many urban amenities: tables, restrooms, telephones, trash cans. The "garden park" area begins where the Coastal Trail ends and is replaced by narrow, dirt footpaths that meander through a carpet of ice plant. Although this iceplant is not a native species, the magenta flowers characteristic of the plant form a "magic carpet" which has come to be identified with Pacific Grove and which is proposed to be protected by the Park Plan. The "rugged coast" begins as the road nears the end of Pt. Pinos and swings south toward Asilomar and the City limits. This stretch is generally undeveloped with large granite outcroppings and open rolling dunes.

The guidelines promote protection of these three characters. Restoration will be with native plant species except in the "garden area" where certain non natives have become a defining visual asset. Where coastal protection is required in the non urban areas the use of golden granite riprap is recommended; seawalls are recommended for the urban areas. Signing and benches must be compatible with the natural qualities of the area. New tree plantings are restricted to areas where they will not block views. These and the other guidelines are consistent with the Coastal Act scenic resource policy and with the certified Land Use Plan.

5. Natural Hazards

Section 30253 of the Coastal Act states in part:

New development shall:

- (1) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard.
- (2) Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.

Section 30235 of the Coastal Act states:

Revetments, breakwaters, groins, harbor channels, seawalls, cliff retaining walls, and other such construction that alters natural shoreline processes shall be permitted when required to serve coastal-dependent uses or to protect existing structures or public beaches in danger from erosion, and when designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse impacts on local shoreline sand supply. Existing marine structures causing water stagnation contributing to pollution problems and fish kills should be phased out or upgraded where feasible.

Amendment 7: Chapter 9, Seawall Program. The Pacific Grove LUP General Policy 2.1.4 provides that the City will minimize the need for new seawall construction through development of an overall Coastal Parks Plan addressing management and, where necessary, restoration of the Pacific Grove coastal park lands, including control of pedestrian use, parking and ground squirrel activities. Any necessary seawall construction and maintenance will be integrated into a Coastal Parks Plan. LUP Policy 2.1.4.3 limits new seawall construction to protection of existing coastal dependent recreational uses and support facilities in critical danger from erosion.

Chapter 9 of the Coastal Parks Plan identifies the repair requirements and urgency for the five major seawalls along the shoreline: Sea Palm Parking Lot and Lovers Point West wall require immediate attention; Hayes Perkins/Otter Point and the Coral Street Beach walls are near-term projects and Lovers Point East is considered a long term priority. Two other areas are identified as possibly requiring shoreline protection: the Crespi Pond inlet and a segment near Point Pinos. These areas are eroding. The Seawall Program recommends that structural protection measures are allowed only when all non engineering solutions have been exhausted; that structures cannot, among other provisions, significantly reduce or restrict beach access, affect shoreline processes, or increase erosion. The Plan recommends the use of seawalls or riprap as consistent with the character of the coastal area and provides directions for preventing erosion, e.g., removing ground squirrels, diverting water runoff.

These provisions are consistent with Coastal Act policies 30253 and 30235 and with policies of the certified Land Use Plan.

6. California Environmental Quality Act

The Coastal Commission's Local Coastal Program development and certification process has been designated by the Secretary of Resources as the functional equivalent of the California Environmental

Quality Act (CEQA). No significant impacts are associated with the proposed amendments. The City of Pacific Grove found the amendments exempt from CEQA. Therefore, the Commission finds that Major Amendment #1-97 is consistent with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.

RESOLUTION NO. 7-013

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE (1) APPROVING A COASTAL PARKS PLAN, AND (2) SUBMITTING THE PLAN TO THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

WHEREAS, as provided and called for in General Policy 2.3.4.3 of the Land Use Plan of city's Local Coastal Program, this council and the planning commission have reviewed and considered a draft Coastal Parks Plan for the management and restoration of Pacific Grove parklands; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission and council have held hearings on the draft as required by law, all notice and hearing requirements have been duly complied with, and the planning commission has made its recommendations to the council regarding the draft plan; and

WHEREAS, the council has received, reviewed and considered the recommended draft, and has considered all comments and written materials received at and prior to the public hearings;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. As finally amended at the regular council meeting of March 5, 1997, this council hereby approves the recommended planning commission draft of the Coastal Parks Plan of the city's Local Coastal Program.

SECTION 2. The plan hereby adopted shall be kept and maintained in the office of the community development director.

SECTION 3. The plan hereby adopted is hereby submitted for approval to the California Coastal Commission pursuant to the California Coastal Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE this 5th day of March, 1997, by the following vote:

AYES: Costello, Davis, Fisher, Huit

NOES: None

ABSENT: Honegger

ABSTAIN: Koffman, Martinez

CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

I, Peter Woodruff, City Clerk of the City of Pacific Grove, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of Resolution No. 7-013 passed and adopted by the Council of the City of Pacific Grove on March 5, 1997.

PETER WOODRUFF
Clerk of the City of Pacific Grove

By: *Carol J. Sims* Pacific Grove LCP Amend #1-97
Carol J. Sims, Deputy CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

Dated: May 2, 1997

EXHIBIT A

JUN 21 1997 10:33 FROM: T.O. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TO: 54274877 P.02

ANTHONY W. LOBAY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
(408) 648-3190



CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

300 16TH STREET
PACIFIC GROVE, CALIFORNIA 93950
TELEPHONE (408) 648-3190
FAX (408) 648-3184

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
(408) 648-3182
BUILDING INSPECTION
(408) 648-3183
HOUSING PROGRAMS
(408) 648-3190
PLANNING/ZONING
(408) 648-3190

June 17, 1997

Lee Otter
District Chief Planner
California Coastal Commission
Central Coast District
725 Front Street, Suite 300
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Subject: Pacific Grove Coastal Parks Plan LCP Submittal

Dear Lee:

Though our Coastal Parks Plan has historically been considered a component of the Local Coastal Program Implementation, after further review we do agree that the Plan is a policy document and can be more appropriately amended into the Land Use Plan. The City's resolution of submittal to the Coastal Commission approves and submits the Parks Plan as a component of the Local Coastal Program and does not specify it is an element of the Implementation Plan. Therefore, we do not feel an additional resolution is necessary. The public has fully participated in the formulation of the document consistent with City and Commission regulations.

Thank you for working with us on this project. If you have any questions, please call.

Sincerely,

Judith J. MacClelland

for

Anthony W. Lobay
Community Development Director

cc: Mayor and City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
Chief Planner

Pacific Grove LCP Amend. #1-97

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

EXHIBIT B

 Recycled
TOTAL P. 02



July 8, 1997

monterey peninsula regional park district

POST OFFICE BOX 935 • CARMEL VALLEY, CALIFORNIA • 93924-0935

RECEIVED

JUL 11 1997

CALIFORNIA
COASTAL COMMISSION
CENTRAL COAST AREA

Tami Grove, Director
California Coastal Commission
725 Front Street, Suite 300
Santa Cruz, California 95060

Re: City of Pacific Grove Land Use Plan Amendment 1-97
Coastal Parks Plan

Dear Ms. Groves:

Attached is a copy of my letter to the city of Pacific Grove, dated January 29, 1997, concerning the City's Coastal Park Plan.

On page two of my letter, I stated, "The District is very strong on the minimum designation of the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail as a Class II trail." The District's position remains the same. We request that Coastal staff recommend some language to encourage the establishment of a Class II bicycle trail, as a minimum, along the City's shoreline.

Please call me if you would like to discuss this issue.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Tate

Gary A. Tate
District Manager

GAT:rb

Enc.

cc: Board of Directors

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Mary Dainton - Ward 4
Pacific Grove, New Monterey,
northern Pebble Beach
Zad Leavy - Ward 5
Carmel, Carmel Valley, Big
Sur, southern Pebble Beach
Judi Lehman - Ward 3
Monterey, Del Rey Oaks,
southern Ft. Ord
Ira J. Lively - Ward 2
Seaside, Sand City
David Salazar - Ward 1
Marina, northern Ft. Ord

DISTRICT MANAGER
Gary A. Tate

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

EXHIBIT C

1 of 7



monterey peninsula regional park district

POST OFFICE BOX 935 • CARMEL VALLEY, CALIFORNIA • 93924-0935

January 29, 1997

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mary Dainton - Ward 4
Pacific Grove, New Monterey,
northern Pebble Beach

Zad Leravy - Ward 5
Carmel, Carmel Valley, Big
Sur, southern Pebble Beach

Judi Lehman - Ward 3
Monterey, Del Rey Oaks
southern Ft. Ord

Ira J. Lively - Ward 2
Seaside, Sand City

David Salazar - Ward 1
Marina, northern Ft. Ord

DISTRICT MANAGER

Gary A. Tate

Sandra Koffman, Mayor
Pacific Grove City Hall
300 Forest Avenue
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

RE: Coastal Parks Plan

Dear Mayor Koffman and Council:

The Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District (District) is a special district whose boundaries include the City of Pacific Grove. The District represents over 150,000 residents of the greater Monterey Peninsula. The District's mission is to acquire and protect undeveloped open space for public use and habitat protection wherever and whenever possible. To support this mission, the District has been a primary force in the creation of the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail and an outspoken advocate of coastal public access and protection.

The District was an original member of the Monterey Peninsula Recreational Trail Joint Powers Agency and has been a long standing cooperating partner with the acquisition, protection, and development of several public benefit projects. These include Lynn "Rip" Van Winkle pine forest preserve (1978), Monterey Peninsula Recreational Trail (1980), Elmarie Dyke Open Space (1988), and Rocky Shores (1991-1995). The Board and staff of the District are proud of the cooperative efforts that have resulted in these quality community projects within the City. We also look forward to continued cooperation.

We have reviewed the City's Coastal Parks Plan Revised Public Review Draft (Plan) with the following comments.

General:

(1) We find the Plan to be very consistent, with a few exceptions, in its treatment of public trust values associated with open space. Those exceptions are addressed below. The District commends the City Council for placing a priority on completion of the City's Local Coastal Program. If fully implemented and funded, we believe that the

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

EXHIBIT C

2 of 7

Sandra Koffman, Mayor

January 29, 1997

Page 2 of 6

community of Pacific Grove will be able to maintain its unique character in the midst of rapidly escalating urban change taking place outside the city.

(2) However, there is much language in the plan that is noncommittal and lacking the weight of formal endorsement or performance. We believe that coastal plans are statements of action and intent. Language that commits provides the community and others with a clear sense of direction. We believe this to be of extremely high value and strongly urge that the language of "should, could be, and may consider" be replaced with more active verbs, such as "shall" or "will". Examples of this are: "*Consider* reorganizing existing parking ..."; "unimproved parking ... *could be* redesigned ..."; "...dunes and coastal bluffs *should be* restored ...". This will bring the entire plan into internal consistency when measured against its own concepts and guidelines and other policy statements such as, "... the City *will* establish a master plan ...". For long-range planning purposes, an action oriented plan is much more effective than a moving target.

Chapter 3 - Trails: Enclosed is a suggested resolution for your consideration in the renaming of the Monterey Peninsula Recreational Trail to the *Monterey Bay Coastal Trail*. This new name reflects the regional nature of its scope and also the link it provides with Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, Monterey Bay State Seashore, and Monterey Bay area communities. We also request that the City acknowledge this name and the participants who made it happen by placing signs at both ends of the trail in Pacific Grove. Sample signage is included, of which the District is willing to fund and construct. The name Monterey Peninsula Recreational Trail appears on pages 21, 22, 27 (thrice), 47 (twice), 69 (thrice), 70 (twice), 72 (thrice), A-9, A-10 (four times), A-16, and A-17.

Chapter 4 - Bikeways:

(1) Refer to the trail name change in the paragraph above.

(2) The District is very strong on the minimum designation of the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail as a Class II trail. The proposal to designate sections of the trail as Class III is inconsistent with the plan's (and the City's) stated guideline "to achieve a *safe* and continuous coastal bikeway system ..." (page 27). The Plan also states that, "Due to the existing narrow street width ... and the intensity of varied recreational uses ... [the trail along] Ocean View Boulevard from 17th Street at Lovers Point to its intersection with Asilomar Avenue ... [is to be designated] as a Class III Bikeway" (page 27). We believe that *because* of the narrowness of the street and the variety of uses that a Class II designation and striping is a necessity for safety. The integrity and safety of this linear accessway should have priority over the convenience of parking cars.

Chapter 5 - Parking and Circulation: The Plan is very good at addressing the public trust value of open space viewshed by proactively stating that it is the intent of the City

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

EXHIBIT C

3 of 7

Sandra Koffman, Mayor

January 29, 1997

Page 3 of 6

"... to enhance the scenic experience of the coast..." "..." to protect and preserve coastal views..." and to not "...increase or expand parking areas." These statements seem to reflect full support for the goals of viewshed protection. However, the specifics of the Guidelines are vague and do not appear to fully produce the outcome of "enhancing the scenic experience of the coast." For example, in Guideline #10, the City proposes to "consider reorganizing parking areas to manage parking and enhance safety conditions for vehicles and pedestrians." But there is no language pertaining to the original goal of "protect[ing] and preserve[ing] coastal views..." We have several suggestions: (1) Eliminate the word "*consider*" and be more committal and dedicated to the proposition. (2) In addition to reorganizing for management and safety, include, "...and to improve scenic coastal views by relocating parking to non-seaward locations as available." (3) And after "It is not the intention... to increase or expand parking areas" insert the language, "*but to consolidate and relocate the existing amount of seaward parking space so as to increase the amount of unobstructed coastal viewshed.*"

Chapter 6 - Coastal Resources:

(1) We find it difficult to substantiate the statement that the City's coast provides "...continuous unobstructed views along Ocean View Boulevard and Sunset Drive" when that same stretch of roadway is overly encumbered with parked automobiles.

(2) Guideline #4: If the area identified is indeed "...of extreme sensitivity..." then we suggest eliminating the non-committal passive verb of "consider." We suggest that to be consistent with the intent of this guideline, reword it as follows: "In areas of extreme sensitivity within ... area, *the City shall*:

- consider use of minimal fencing ...
- consider defining appropriate limits ...
- consider restricting permanent ...

(3) Guideline #5: This is the only place in the entire plan that a guideline directly addresses the issue of enhancing "...the scenic experience of the coast..." and "...protect[ing] and preserve[ing] coastal views..." We very strongly urge the City to maintain consistency with the policy statement to "...control unrestricted parking" and to strengthen it by adding at the end of the statement, "*and to consolidate and relocate the existing amount of seaward parking space so as to increase the amount of unobstructed coastal viewshed.*"

(4) Guideline #7: We suggest "*Pursue*" in lieu of "Consider."

(5) Guideline #14: We suggest that the first sentence be changed as follows, "~~Consider providing~~ *Provide appropriate* ..." [refer to the attached article].

Sandra Koffman, Mayor

January 29, 1997

Page 4 of 6

The subsection on Scenic Resources is completely devoid of any language regarding the fundamental and inherent scenic resource issue of viewshed. Guidelines 18, 19, and 20 all address new development and completely skirt the issue of auto parking as a substantial blight on the scenic resources of the city's coastal public trust values. We suggest that this issue be addressed and reinforced in this section to give it legitimate weight of concern. We recommend language similar in content to that already mentioned above.

Chapter 7 - Visual Quality: Our comments for this section follow those of the paragraph immediately above. We suggest that the issue of unrestricted and obtrusive auto parking on the seaward sides of Ocean View and Sunset be addressed and reinforced in this section to give it legitimate weight of concern. We suggest language similar in content to that already mentioned above.

Chapter 8 - Access Guide: Our suggested comments reflect our very strong belief and professional opinion that (1) a Class II Monterey Bay Coastal Trail should be designated and implemented for its entire length in the Phase 3 section and (2) unrestricted parking be controlled, consolidated, and relocated to the maximum potential (even if this results in reduced auto parking) in order to free the coastline of this obtrusive and incongruous intrusion into the viewshed.

Map 1; Recommended Actions, Trails: The District is very keen on wanting appropriate signage at the City boundary along the trail identifying and recognizing the District for its role in the creation of the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail and its partnership with the City. The District will fund and construct this signage.

Map 2; Recommended Actions, Parking: We recommend that the City begin creating seaward no parking "windows" toward the northern portion of this planning area around Rocky Shores. This will begin a phase-in that increases as one travels east.

Signage: The District is very keen on wanting an appropriate sign established in the Rocky Shores area that acknowledges the efforts and actions taken by the District in cooperation with the City and others. The District is willing to fund and construct this sign.

Map 3; Recommended Actions, Parking (#7): We recommend that the City take a more proactive stance as follows: ~~"If parking demands increase in the future, consider~~ Reorganizing existing parking areas to manage parking and enhance safety conditions for vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians." We sincerely hope that "manage parking" refers to "...enhance the scenic experience of the coast..." and "...protect and preserve coastal views..."

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

EXHIBIT C 5 of 7

Sandra Koffman, Mayor

January 29, 1997

Page 5 of 6

We also suggest an additional recommendation that "Viewshed no-parking "windows" between the unimproved but designated parking areas will be created to "... enhance the scenic experience of the coast..." and "...protect and preserve coastal views...". This will bring internal consistency between a stated plan purpose of coastal viewshed protection and recommended action.

Map 4; Recommended Actions, Bikeways: We recommend that the City include a second action item that, "Provide a continuous Class II bikeway east of Asilomar Avenue." We suggest eliminating seaward side parking which will also have the benefit of truly establishing "...continuous unobstructed views along Ocean View Boulevard and Sunset Drive" and optimizing bicycle safety.

Parking (#7): We recommend that the City take a more proactive stance as follows: ~~"If parking demands increase in the future, consider Reorganizing~~ existing parking areas to manage parking and enhance safety conditions for vehicles, *bicyclists* and pedestrians." We sincerely hope that "manage parking" refers to "...enhance the scenic experience of the coast..." and "...protect and preserve coastal views..."

Map 5; Recommended Actions, Bikeways: We recommend that the City include a third action item that, "Provide a continuous Class II bikeway along Ocean View Boulevard and 17th Street from the terminal end of the existing Class I trail." We suggest eliminating seaward side parking which will also have the benefit of truly establishing "...continuous unobstructed views along Ocean View..." and optimizing bicycle safety.

Parking: We recommend that the City take a more proactive stance by modifying action #10 as follows: ~~"If parking demands increase in the future, consider Reorganizing~~ existing parking areas to manage parking and enhance safety conditions for vehicles, *bicyclists* and pedestrians." We sincerely hope that "manage parking" refers to "...enhance the scenic experience of the coast..." and "...protect and preserve coastal views..."

Map 6; Recommended Actions, Trails (#1): The District is very keen on wanting appropriate signage at the City boundary along the trail identifying and recognizing the District for its role in the creation of the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail and its partnership with the City. The District will fund and construct this signage.

The District realizes the tough choice that needs to be made with regard to the on-street seaward parking issue, but is also quite cognizant of the spectacularly unique opportunity the City has to truly protect and enhance its precious coastal viewshed while

Sandra Koffman, Mayor
January 29, 1997
Page 6 of 6

facilitating non-motorized experiences and vastly improving bicycle safety. The District is willing to assist the City to meet this challenge.

Respectfully,

Gary A. Tate

Gary Tate
District Manager

cc: Board of Directors

